

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 17 and 19 being the independent claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. ("the Kimoto patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317 to Glorikian ("the Glorikian patent").

The Kimoto patent discloses a communication system including a mobile unit that can be used to transmit and receive data to/from a database. The information received from the database can be retrieved based on the position of the mobile unit. The information retrieved from the database includes descriptive information such as a business name, address, phone number, business description, etc.

The Glorikian patent discloses a system for delivering position-related information from a database to a remote device. The information is delivered to the device via a cellular telephone Internet link between the database and the remote device. In a separate embodiment, information is delivered to a device used indoors from a local indoor system.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17 and their Dependent Claims

Independent claim 1 recites "receiving location-centric attribute information from said information system related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, *the geographic position being outside of the landmark*, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior physical feature and an exterior physical feature of said landmark." *Independent claim 7* recites "transmitting location-centric attribute information

related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, *the geographic position being outside of the landmark*, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior physical feature and an exterior physical feature of said landmark.”

Independent claim 13 recites “a receiver configured to receive from said information system at least one location identifier based on said geographic position, said at least one location identifier being representative of a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the geographic position being outside of the landmark, and to receive location-centric attribute information related to said at least one location identifier, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior physical feature and an exterior physical feature of said landmark.” *Independent claim 15* recites “receiving location-centric attribute information from said information system, said location-centric attribute information related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the geographic position being outside of the landmark, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior physical feature and an exterior physical feature of said landmark.” *Independent claim 17* recites “a wireless device operable to provide geographic position information to said information database and to receive from said information database at least one location identifier based on said geographic position, said location identifier being representative of a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the geographic position being outside of the landmark, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior physical feature and an exterior physical feature of the landmark.”

As acknowledged by the Examiner, the Kimoto patent fails to disclose any information that is related to physical features of a landmark as recited in claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17. The Examiner states that the Glorikian patent discloses “characteristics of structure from the outside

and the inside (col. 5, lines 43-56; col. 6, lines 1-14; Fig. 3; Fig. 4, refs. 85, 87, 103, 105).” The Examiner cites portions of the Glorikian patent that fail to support such a conclusion. In fact, the cited portions of the Glorikian patent do not disclose receiving/providing a single physical feature, either interior or exterior, as recited by the independent claims. The Glorikian patent (col. 5, line 43-col. 6, line 14) discloses the presentation of historical information about various locations, not physical features of those locations.

With reference to claim 19 (which is discussed in detail below), the Examiner suggests that the system of the Glorikian patent depicts “characteristics of a house from the outside and the inside.” (Office Action at page 10). The Examiner states that “the system portrays information about the John Boys’ house, where people resided.” The description related to “John Boys’ house” in the Glorikian patent, however, is wholly unrelated to any physical feature of any landmark. The Glorikian patent discloses “As the client nears John Boys’ house on the banks of the James river, specific information about John Boys (who was titular head of Martin’s Hundred for a time) and his family will be pushed.” (Col. 6, lines 5-8, emphasis added). There is simply no disclosure whatsoever of any physical feature.

Additionally, while the Glorikian patent does disclose the receipt/transmission of certain features of an interior space in another embodiment of the invention, there is no disclosure or suggestion that such features are transmitted to a geographic position where the geographic position is *outside of the landmark* as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17 are allowable over the Kimoto patent and the Glorikian patent, either alone or in combination. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, 16, 18 and 21-24 are also allowable.

Independent Claim 19 and its Dependent Claims

Independent claim 19 recites “receiving location-centric physical attribute information from said information system, said location-centric physical attribute information being related to a residential dwelling proximate to said geographic position, the geographic position being outside of the residential dwelling; receiving an attribute request, the attribute request indicating at least a portion of the location-centric physical attribute information; and displaying detailed provider information uniquely associated with the at least a portion of the location-centric physical attribute information indicated by the attribute request.”

As noted by the Examiner, the Kimoto patent fails to disclose or suggest “location-centric physical attribute information related to a residential dwelling” as recited in claim 19. Neither the Kimoto patent, nor the Glorikian patent disclose or suggest receiving physical attribute information based on a geographic position where “the geographic position [is] outside of the residential dwelling” as recited in independent claim 19. For at least these reasons, independent claim 19 is allowable. Based at least on its dependence on independent claim 19, dependent claim 20 is also allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: October 12, 2004

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile